

Page 2REMARKS

Entry of this Amendment in response to the Office Action dated July 12, 2005 is respectfully requested.

For the reasons set forth below, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in the claims includes features which are not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited reference. Reconsideration is, therefore, respectfully requested.


Claims 1, 3, 7, 8 and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b), or in the alternative, under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being anticipated or obvious over McCarty, '437.

It is respectfully submitted that even if McCarty '437 is a valid reference, Applicant's claimed wall thickness of between 0.005 inches to about 0.05 inches is not anticipated by the 0.01 and 0.15 wall thickness range disclosed in McCarty '437. Applicant's claimed range covers a much thinner wall thickness to a much greater wall thickness while still providing the desired minimization of cue ball deflection.

For these reasons, it is respectfully submitted that Applicant's invention as set forth in the claims is not anticipated or rendered obvious by the cited reference.

Respectfully submitted,

YOUNG, BASILE, HANLON, MacFARLANE,  
WOOD & HELMHOLDT, P.C.



William M. Hanlon, Jr.  
Attorney for Applicant(s)  
Registration No. 28422  
(248) 649-3333

3001 West Big Beaver Rd., Suite 624  
Troy, Michigan 48084-3107  
Dated: January 12, 2006  
WMH/dge